

UDC 811.161.2'42:81'23

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/97-3-35>**Oleksii RUBANIAK,***orcid.org/0009-0004-2498-1007**PhD Student at the Department of Applied Linguistics**Lviv Polytechnic National University**(Lviv, Ukraine) oleksii.m.rubaniak@lpnu.ua*

## RECONTEXTUALIZATION OF THE SLOGAN “SLAVA UKRAINI!” AS A MECHANISM OF DISCURSIVE TRANSFORMATION OF NATIONAL IDENTITY: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

*This article examines the mechanisms of recontextualization of the slogan “Slava Ukraini!” (“Glory to Ukraine!”) as a discursive instrument for constructing national identity. Drawing on the theoretical foundations of T. van Leeuwen’s critical discourse analysis, specifically the concept of recontextualization of social practices, and T. van Dijk’s sociocognitive approach to discursive power and mental models, the study traces the diachronic transformation of the slogan from a student greeting of the Kharkiv community in the late 19th century to a national and global symbol of modern Ukraine. Five main stages of recontextualization have been identified: the student-revolutionary stage (late 19th century – 1921), nationalist recontextualization (1920s–1950s), Soviet deletion and dissident preservation (1950s–1980s), democratic revival (1989–2013), and national institutionalization with globalization (2014–2024). Each stage is accompanied by changes in pragmatic functions, expansion of the semantic field, and reinterpretation of ideological content. The analytical categories of substitution, deletion, rearrangement, and addition are applied to describe the specific mechanisms of semantic shift at each stage. The study also integrates J. Kristeva’s theory of intertextuality and J. L. Austin’s speech act theory, particularly the concept of the declarative. It is demonstrated that the recontextualization of the slogan illustrates broader patterns of transformation of discursive models of national identity in Ukraine during 1991–2024, specifically the progressive expansion of the slogan’s inclusivity and the pluralization of its pragmatic functions. The role of institutional codification, sports discourse, and international solidarity in the context of the full-scale war is analyzed separately.*

**Key words:** recontextualization, critical discourse analysis, national identity, political discourse, “Slava Ukraini!”, discursive transformation, speech act.

**Олексій РУБАНЯК,***orcid.org/0009-0004-2498-1007**аспірант кафедри прикладної лінгвістики**Національного університету «Львівська політехніка»**(Львів, Україна) oleksii.m.rubaniak@lpnu.ua*

## РЕКОНТЕКСТУАЛІЗАЦІЯ ГАСЛА «СЛАВА УКРАЇНІ!» ЯК МЕХАНІЗМ ДИСКУРСИВНОЇ ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЇ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ ІДЕНТИЧНОСТІ: КРИТИЧНИЙ ДИСКУРС-АНАЛІЗ

*У статті досліджено механізми реконтекстуалізації гасла «Слава Україні!» як дискурсивного інструменту конструювання національної ідентичності. На основі теоретичних засад критичного дискурс-аналізу Т. ван Леувена (концепція реконтекстуалізації соціальних практик) та соціокогнітивного підходу Т. ван Дейка (дискурсивна влада та ментальні моделі) простежено діахронічну трансформацію гасла від студентського привітання харківської громади кінця ХІХ ст. до загальнонаціонального та глобального символу сучасної України. Виявлено п’ять основних етапів реконтекстуалізації: студентсько-революційний (кінець ХІХ ст. – 1921), націоналістичний (1920-ті–1950-ті), радянська делеція та дисидентське збереження (1950-ті–1980-ті), демократичне відродження (1989–2013) та загальнонаціональна інституціалізація з глобалізацією (2014–2024). Кожен етап супроводжувався зміною прагматичних функцій, розширенням семантичного поля та переосмисленням ідеологічного навантаження. Застосовано аналітичні категорії субституції, делеції, перестановки та доповнення для опису конкретних механізмів семантичного зсуву на кожному етапі. Методологія дослідження поєднує критичний дискурс-аналіз за моделлю ван Леувена (ідентифікація субституцій, делецій, перестановок та доповнень), когнітивно-дискурсивний аналіз за ван Дейком (реконструкція ментальних моделей та ідеологічних структур), теорію інтертекстуальності Ю. Кристевої та теорію мовленнєвих актів Дж. Л. Остіна. Матеріалом дослідження слугують історичні джерела (мемуари генерала М. Омелянович-Павленка, О. Коваленка, І. Островерхика, преса періоду Української революції), законодавчі акти (Закон України № 2587-VIII від 04.10.2018), медіатексти та міжнародні виступи, матеріали спортивного дискурсу (документи щодо форми збірної з футболу) та дані соціологічних опитувань (Український інститут майбутнього, 2021). Доведено, що процес реконтекстуалізації*

*гасла ілюструє ширші закономірності трансформації дискурсивних моделей національної ідентичності в Україні протягом 1991–2024 рр., зокрема послідовне розширення інклюзивності гасла – від вузького кола студентської інтелігенції до міжнародної спільноти – та функціональну плюралізацію: нашіарування нових прагматичних функцій (від привітання до сакрального свідчення) без заміщення попередніх. Окремо проаналізовано роль інституційної кодифікації, спортивного дискурсу та міжнародної солідарності в контексті повномасштабної війни. Встановлено, що еволюція діалогічної пари («По всій землі слава!» → «Героям слава!») маркує зміну прагматичних моделей: від перформативного декларативу, що проголошує визнання, до канонізуючого акту встановлення колективного пантеону героїв.*

*Ключові слова:* реконтекстуалізація, критичний дискурс-аналіз, національна ідентичність, політичний дискурс, «Слава Україні!», дискурсивна трансформація, мовленнєвий акт.

**Problem statement.** The study of mechanisms of discursive construction of national identity is a priority area of contemporary linguistics, situated at the intersection of sociolinguistics and critical discourse analysis. In the context of Russia's armed aggression against Ukraine, the analysis of the discursive practices through which the nation's collective consciousness is formed and strengthened becomes particularly relevant. Among such practices, recontextualization occupies a prominent place – the process of transferring discursive elements from one context to another, accompanied by transformations in their meaning, pragmatic functions, and ideological content (Fairclough, 1992). R. Wodak and her colleagues convincingly demonstrated that national identity is not a natural given but is constructed in discourse through strategies of constructing a shared past, defining "us" and "them," and creating narratives of unity (Wodak, 2009: 1–4; De Cillia, Reisigl, Wodak, 1999: 153). These strategies are realized through specific discursive devices – slogans, ritual formulas, greeting patterns – that function as "crystallizations" of broader identity models, condensing complex cognitive structures into concise formulas (Reisigl, Wodak, 2001: 45). N. Saltovska and D. Saltovska demonstrated that the tradition of slogan-based communication during liberation struggles remains unchanged, and the slogans "Slava Ukraini! – Heroyam Slava!" carry the semantic load of resilience and love of freedom (Saltovska, Saltovska, 2022: 69). The slogan "Slava Ukraini!" is one of the most vivid examples of recontextualization in Ukrainian political discourse. Its more than century-long history reflects key stages in the formation of the Ukrainian nation: from student communities in Kharkiv in the late 19th century through the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, World War II, and the struggle for independence in 1989–1991 to the Revolution of Dignity and the full-scale war of 2022–2024. Each of these stages is marked by a specific recontextualization of the slogan that corresponds to the transformation of discursive models of identity. At the same time, the slogan functions simultaneously on several levels: as a performative speech act (greeting, call to action), as a marker of

group identity (distinguishing "us" from "them"), as a carrier of cognitive frames (heroism, sacrifice, glory), and as an object of discursive struggle (attempts at stigmatization by the enemy). The relevance of this study is determined by several factors. First, the war-time context of 2022–2024 has caused an unprecedented intensification of recontextualization processes of national symbols, which requires linguistic reflection. Second, there is a need for the systematic application of van Leeuwen's analytical apparatus to Ukrainian material – specifically, his framework has not yet been used to study Ukrainian national slogans. Third, the discursive struggle around the slogan (Russia's attempts to qualify it as "Nazi," disputes over the football jersey) makes scholarly analysis of its semantic evolution necessary.

**Analysis of research.** The central theoretical foundation is the concept of recontextualization developed by T. van Leeuwen (Van Leeuwen, 2008). Building on B. Bernstein's ideas about "pedagogic recontextualization" (Bernstein, 1990: 184), van Leeuwen substantiates a broader thesis: all discourses are recontextualizations of social practices, and all knowledge is ultimately grounded in practice. He proceeds from the primacy of practice – a principle that runs through European and American sociology from E. Durkheim through P. Bourdieu to contemporary practice-oriented approaches. Discourses, according to van Leeuwen, are not merely reflections of reality, but active transformations of practices carried out in the interests of particular social contexts. The key elements of social practices that undergo recontextualization include: actors and their roles, actions and modes of performance, spatial and temporal parameters. Van Leeuwen identifies four mechanisms of transformation. Substitution – the most fundamental transformation, in which elements of actual social practice are replaced by semiotic elements; the nature of substitutions depends on the context into which the practice is recontextualized. Deletion – the removal of individual elements of social practice; some deletions are "innocent," while others are linked to propagandistic strategies. Rearrangement – changes in the sequence of elements, which can significantly affect

causal interpretation. Addition – the incorporation of elements absent from the practice itself, primarily purposes and legitimations; van Leeuwen identifies four types of discursive legitimation: authorization (reference to authority), moral evaluation (appeal to value systems), rationalization (instrumental or theoretical justification), and narrativization (legitimation through storytelling) (Van Leeuwen, 2008: 105–106). A complementary framework is provided by T. van Dijk's sociocognitive approach, which treats discourse as an "interface" between social structures and mental representations. Discursive struggle determines dominant interpretations of reality, and control over discourse is a form of social power. Power manifests through control over "access to discourse" – who has the right to speak, in what contexts, and to which audiences (Van Dijk, 2008: 14). J. Kristeva's theory of intertextuality (1969) establishes that every text is a "mosaic of quotations" that absorbs and transforms other texts. The slogan "Slava Ukraini!" in each new context carries within itself the "memory" of all previous contexts – from student communities to the last words of heroes. This intertextual layering is a key characteristic of the slogan and explains its symbolic power. J. L. Austin's (1962) and J. R. Searle's (1969) speech act theory is also important for our analysis. Searle expanded Austin's classification by identifying declaratives as a distinct class of illocutionary acts that alter institutional reality by the very fact of their utterance. As will be shown below, the slogan "Slava Ukraini!" at various stages has functioned precisely as a declarative, performatively creating the reality it proclaims. Among Ukrainian scholarship, L. Masenko's analysis of over eight hundred resistance slogans demonstrates that revolutionary slogans simultaneously perform social functions (mobilization, consolidation) and linguistic functions (communicative, expressive, poetic), which aligns with our approach to analyzing the polysemic structure of the slogan (Masenko, 2015: 12). The research material comprises several groups of sources: historical sources (memoirs of General M. Omelianovich-Pavlenko, O. Kovalenko, I. Ostrovershko, press materials from the period of the Ukrainian Revolution), legislative acts (Law of Ukraine No. 2587-VIII of 04.10.2018), media texts and international speeches, sports discourse materials (documents related to the national football team jersey), and sociological survey data (Ukrainian Institute for the Future, 2021). The methodology combines critical discourse analysis following van Leeuwen's model (identification of substitutions, deletions, rearrangements, and additions), cognitive-discursive analysis following van Dijk (reconstruction of mental models and ideologi-

cal structures), historical-discursive analysis (tracing evolution of contexts), and pragmatic analysis of illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect.

**Purpose of the article.** The aim is a comprehensive analysis of the mechanisms of recontextualization of the slogan "Slava Ukraini!" in the context of discursive construction of national identity, using the theoretical apparatus of T. van Leeuwen and T. van Dijk. The objectives are: (1) to systematize the theoretical foundations of recontextualization analysis; (2) to reconstruct the diachronic trajectory of the slogan's functioning; (3) to identify specific mechanisms of transformation (substitution, deletion, addition) at each stage; (4) to identify correlations between recontextualization and changes in pragmatic functions and the circle of actors.

**Presentation of the main material.** Five stages of recontextualization have been identified, each accompanied by specific mechanisms of semantic transformation.

**Stage 1: From student greeting to revolutionary slogan (late 19th c. – 1921).** The first documented context of the formula "Slava Ukraini!" was the environment of the Kharkiv student community of the late 19th century – the same milieu from which the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (RUP), the first modern Ukrainian political party in Russian-ruled Ukraine, emerged in 1900. The response was "Po vsiy zemli slava!" ("Glory throughout the land!"). The first known mention is associated with an episode described in the memoirs of O. Kovalenko: M. Levytskyi, founder of the Ukrainian cooperative movement, encountered a student whistling "Ukraine Has Not Yet Perished" and called out "Slava Ukraini!" Notably, researchers observe that the cry was formulated on the basis of the first line of P. Chubynsky's anthem (1862), which already mentions the "glory of Ukraine." At this stage, the slogan performed the function of a group marker – an identifier of belonging to a narrow circle of nationally conscious intelligentsia. In van Dijk's terms, it functioned as an element of "in-group discourse" accessible only to "insiders" (Van Dijk, 2008: 14). The response "Po vsiy zemli slava!" deserves separate linguistic attention. The concept of slava (glory) functions here as the central semantic element with its own field of meanings: reputation, recognition, renown, memory. The response activates not a metaphor of source, but a metaphor of SPREAD or COVERAGE (Lakoff, Johnson, 1980: 14): Ukraine is conceived not as an enclosed space, but as a subject whose glory transcends spatial boundaries. This corresponds to a model of national identity oriented toward external recognition – self-definition through the gaze of the Other, through how the nation appears from the out-

side (Anderson, 2006: 6). A nation exists insofar as it is known and recognized. Such a response reflects the stage of formation and aspiration of a young Ukrainian nation toward self-assertion as an equal among equals. In J. L. Austin's terms, the response is a performative speech act with a declarative function: it proclaims the recognition that does not yet exist, in order to create it (Austin, 1962: 6). As early as September 1916, in Detroit (USA), during a large Ukrainian gathering attended by 1,200 people, the national flag was unfurled, after which the hall erupted with cries of "Slava Ukraini! Khay zhyve Ukraina!" – evidence that even before the 1917 revolution, the slogan functioned as a transnational identity marker. With the beginning of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917, the first large-scale recontextualization occurred. The slogan moved from student life into the public political space. In van Leeuwen's terms, a substitution of actors took place (Van Leeuwen, 2008: 17): instead of a narrow circle of students – mass participants in the revolution. On July 12, 1917, during a parade of Ukrainian military units, soldiers responded to Rada chairman M. Hrushevskyy with a resounding "Slava Ukraini!" Characteristically, Hrushevskyy was restrained: when a crowd gathered beneath the building, he responded from the porch: "Long live democratic Russia!" – illustrating the discursive struggle between radical national self-assertion and moderate autonomism. Captain I. Ostrovershko recalled that soldiers greeted Russian generals with "Slava Ukraini, pane henerale!" – a performative act of decolonization. In 1920, General M. Omelianovich-Pavlenko introduced "Slava Ukraini!" as a formal military greeting by official order, with the response "Slava! Slava! Slava!" (Omelianovich-Pavlenko, 2007: 234). This marks the first institutional recontextualization – a form of "rationalization" in van Leeuwen's terms, the proceduralizing of social action.

**Stage 2: Nationalist recontextualization (1920s–1950s).** The second stage is associated with the organized nationalist movement's appropriation of the slogan. In the "Legion of Ukrainian Nationalists" (1925–1929), the response "Heroyam slava!" appeared, subsequently adopted by OUN(b) and officially approved in 1941. Parallel variants existed: OUN(m) used "Naviky slava!" ("Forever glory!"), and supporters of Hetman Skoropadskyy – "Slava kozatstvu!" ("Glory to the Cossacks!"). Several key transformations occurred. First, deletion: the general democratic component was removed from the semantic field – while "Po vsiy zemli slava!" implied universal recognition, "Heroyam slava!" focuses on in-group canonization. Second, substitution of the response: the replacement significantly altered the

pragmatic structure – instead of a declarative proclamation of recognition, a glorification of a specific value category appeared. This marks the formation of the NATION-AS-PANTHEON-OF-HEROES model, where heroism functions not merely as a designation of a social group, but as a mechanism of collective memory, canonization, and national pantheon establishment. Third, addition of an ideological element: the slogan became part of a broader ritual including "Slava natsii! – Smert voroham!" ("Glory to the Nation! – Death to the enemies!"), giving it a distinctly military coloring (Van Leeuwen, 2008: 106). The component "Heroyam slava!" appeals to the concept of sacrifice and readiness for heroic deeds, while "Smert voroham!" realizes a separate pragmatic function of delimitation. The deliberate choice of "Heroyam slava!" over "Vozhdevi slava!" ("Glory to the Leader!") distinguishes the Ukrainian slogan from authoritarian models (German "Heil Hitler!", Italian "Duce! Duce!"). As historian Yu. Yuzych notes, they fundamentally changed who is the center of the Ukrainian movement – not the leader, but the heroes, that is, the collective (Yuzych). UPA fighters and OUN underground operatives gave the slogan an existential dimension: it became a formula of last words before execution. In Carpathian Ukraine in March 1939, young fighters said "Slava Ukraini!" before being shot. The illocutionary force shifted from greeting to sacred testimony, and the perlocutionary effect from group consolidation to symbolic victory over physical annihilation.

**Stage 3: Soviet deletion and dissident preservation (1950s–1980s).** Soviet authorities applied a strategy of total deletion: the slogan's use was criminalized and stigmatized as a manifestation of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism." In van Dijk's terms, this is a classic example of discourse control through restricting access to certain discursive resources (Van Dijk, 2008: 14). In Foucault's terms, this reflects the mechanisms of control over the production of discourse (Foucault, 2002: 49). The ideological legitimation of the ban was built on substitution of meaning: the national greeting was redefined as a "fascist" and "Banderite" slogan – an example of "moral evaluation" as a mechanism of delegitimation (Van Leeuwen, 2008: 106). Soviet propaganda created a mental model in which "Slava Ukraini!" = "fascism" = "enemy," and this model proved extraordinarily resilient: its recurrences are observed today in Russian propaganda. As evidenced by the Russian Ministry of Justice's decision of January 18, 2024, to include the slogan in the list of "Nazi symbols," this strategy of delegitimation remains active. However, in conditions of prohibition a paradoxical recontextualization

occurred: deprived of public circulation, the slogan moved into the space of private memory, family narratives, and diaspora discourse, where it preserved and even intensified its symbolic potential. In the context of underground use, each utterance became a performative act of resistance – a speech act that simultaneously expressed identity and violated the power order. The diaspora preserved the slogan in everyday use, creating a "recontextualization bifurcation": in Ukraine the slogan was taboo, while beyond its borders it was a normative greeting. This divergence became a source of cultural shock when the diaspora met mainland Ukrainians after 1991 and simultaneously a resource for restoring the interrupted tradition.

**Stage 4: Democratic recontextualization (1989–2013).** The revival of the slogan in the late 1980s and early 1990s marks the fourth stage. During the Revolution on Granite (1990) and independence rallies, "Slava Ukraini! – Heroyam slava!" returned as a mass public greeting in a fundamentally different discursive context – not underground resistance, but an open democratic movement. The slogan was heard in Galicia, Transcarpathia, and Kyiv, marking its all-Ukrainian character. A partial deletion of the narrowly ideological component occurred: the slogan was used not only by nationalist organizations but by a broad circle of democratically oriented citizens – students, intellectuals, workers. In van Leeuwen's terms, this is a "substitution of actors" – expansion of the circle of those who have the "right" to use the formula (Van Leeuwen, 2008: 17). Simultaneously, a substitution of the antagonist occurred: if in the OUN-UPA context the "enemy" was specific occupiers, in the context of the Orange Revolution (2004) and Euromaidan (2013–2014) the slogan was directed against corrupt authorities. Each social crisis – 1990, 2000, 2004, 2013 – expanded the geography and social base, which aligns with observations on identity model transformation after Euromaidan (Kulyk, 2019: 605). The Revolution of Dignity (2013–2014) was pivotal: "Slava Ukraini! – Heroyam slava!" was heard on the Maidan daily, entered everyday speech of millions. The death of the Heavenly Hundred gave "heroes" concrete faces – narrative legitimation in van Leeuwen's terms (Van Leeuwen, 2008: 106). A literary testimony of this cognitive shift appears in Ye. Steblivskyi's novel *Fury*, where the protagonist confesses: he once felt uncomfortable hearing "Slava Ukraini!" – it seemed "too aggressive" – but after 2014 questioned why these words had seemed "somewhat showy and rehearsed" (Steblyvskyi, 2024). This episode precisely captures the moment of individual mental model transformation – the slogan moves from the category of "too radical" to "ours."

**Stage 5: National institutionalization and globalization (2014–2024).** Law No. 2587-VIII (2018) codified "Slava Ukraini! – Heroyam slava!" as the official greeting in the Armed Forces and National Police, replacing the Soviet "Greetings, comrades!" On August 24, 2018, the greeting was first sounded at the Independence Day parade ceremony. In M. Billig's terms, this institutionalization is simultaneously a form of "banal nationalism" – the daily unreflected reproduction of national identity through routine practices (Billig, 1995: 6). In sports discourse, the inscription "Slava Ukraini" on the national football jersey (2018) provoked international discursive struggle: Russian official I. Lebedev demanded review by an "ethics committee," and in 2021 UEFA initially approved the jersey with "Heroyam slava!" before demanding its removal under Russian pressure. In van Dijk's terms, competing mental models clashed (Van Dijk, 2008: 14). After 2022, the slogan became a marker of international solidarity with Ukraine. British PM B. Johnson concluded his address to the House of Commons (24 February 2022) and to the Verkhovna Rada (3 May 2022) with "Slava Ukraini" – the Rada chamber responded "Heroyam slava!" European Parliament President R. Metsola concluded her speech (9 February 2023) with the same words, triggering a choral "Heroyam Slava!" from the entire chamber. In Heritage and Greatbatch's terms, such collective vocal audience response is rhetorically conditioned: it requires a recognizable stimulus-formula ensuring synchronicity of response (Heritage, Greatbatch, 1986: 112). In Lithuanian basketball (March 2026), fans of rival clubs – Zalgiris (Kaunas) and Rytas (Vilnius) – united chanting "Slava Ukraini" and "Heroyam Slava." The slogan preserves its Ukrainian phonetic form and dialogic structure even in a non-Ukrainian-speaking environment, functioning as an interlingual marker similar to how "Vive la France!" is used without translation. The culminating moment was the case of O. Matsiyevskiyi (December 2022), who uttered "Slava Ukraini!" before execution by occupiers. In van Leeuwen's terms, an "addition" of the highest value legitimation occurred – the willingness to sacrifice one's life for the symbol. In Kristeva's terms, Matsiyevskiyi's words absorb the entire preceding chain of contexts – from student greetings to 1939 fighters' last words – producing a new semantic quality (Kristeva, 1969: 146). According to the Ukrainian Institute for the Future survey (2021), 50% of respondents considered "Slava Ukraini!" the slogan of contemporary Ukrainians, with young people associating it primarily with the Orange Revolution, Revolution of Dignity, and war rather than with OUN-UPA – indicating a transformation of mental models associated with the slogan.

Systemic patterns of recontextualization include four key dynamics. First, expansion of the circle of actors student community – national liberation movement – organized nationalism – democratic movement – entire nation – international community. This dynamic illustrates sequential substitution of the subject in van Leeuwen's terms: each new stage expands the circle of those who have the "right" to use the slogan. Second, functional pluralization: greeting – mobilization call – military greeting – act of resistance – institutional formula – sports symbol – marker of international solidarity – sacred testimony. Each new recontextualization does not replace previous functions but layers upon them, forming a polysemic structure. A person uttering "Slava Ukraini!" today simultaneously greets, mobilizes, attests to identity, performs a ritual, and joins a global community – all functions are active and coexist. Third, transformation of the response as an indicator of identity model shifts: "Po vsiy zemli slava!" (declarative of recognition) – "Slava! Slava! Slava!" (acclamation) – "Kozakam slava!" / "Hetmanovi slava!" (personification) – "Naviky slava!" (temporal projection) – "Heroyam slava!" (canonization). The dominance of the last variant reflects a tendency toward collective rather than authoritarian identity in Ukrainian discourse – confirmed by the deliberate choice of "Heroyam slava!" over "Vozhdevi slava!" in the 1930s–1940s. Fourth, competition of interpretations as a driver of recontextualization: Soviet stigmatization as "fascist," Russian labeling as "Nazi," some Ukrainian liberals considering it too "nationalist," and for the majority of Ukrainians – a greeting and symbol of resistance. This competition is not an obstacle but the driving force of recontextualization: each interpretation stimulates a counter-interpretation, and it is precisely in this dynamic that the current meaning is formed.

**Conclusions.** The analysis allows for the following conclusions.

**First**, recontextualization of "Slava Ukraini!" is a diachronic process spanning over a century with five main stages (student, nationalist, Soviet deletion, democratic revival, national institutionalization), each correlating with key transformations in pragmatic functions and sociopolitical context.

**Second**, the theoretical apparatus of T. van Leeuwen (substitution, deletion, rearrangement, addition) and T. van Dijk (discursive struggle, discourse control, mental models) proves adequate and productive for analyzing such processes in Ukrainian political discourse: van Leeuwen's categories describe the dynamics of transformations, while van Dijk's categories explain their cognitive and social consequences.

**Third**, the trajectory demonstrates progressive expansion of the slogan's inclusivity (from student community to international community, documented at each of the five stages) and functional pluralization (layering of new pragmatic functions – from greeting to sacred testimony – without replacing previous ones, as confirmed by the simultaneous relevance of all functions in contemporary usage).

**Fourth**, the evolution of the dialogic pair ("Po vsiy zemli slava!" – "Heroyam slava!") reveals a change in pragmatic models: from performative declarative (Austin, 1962) that proclaims recognition, to canonizing act establishing a collective pantheon of heroes – linguistically marking a tendency toward collective rather than authoritarian identity, confirmed by the deliberate choice of "Heroyam slava!" over "Vozhdevi slava!" in the 1930s–1940s. Fifth, Matsiyevskyi's case (2022) demonstrates that recontextualization can acquire a sacred dimension, transforming a speech act into an act of ultimate self-assertion and closing the diachronic line into a symbolic circle with Carpathian Ukraine fighters of 1939. Prospects for further research include quantitative corpus analysis of the frequency and contexts of use of "Slava Ukraini!" in presidential speeches 1991–2024, and comparative analysis of recontextualization of analogous national slogans (Vive la France!, God Save the King).

#### СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Про внесення змін до деяких законів України щодо вітання «Слава Україні! – Героям слава!» : Закон України від 04.10.2018 № 2587-VIII. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/go/2587-19> (дата звернення: 25.03.2026).
2. Масенко Л. «Разом – сила!»: Риторика українського спротиву. Соціолінгвістичні есеї. Київ : Кліо, 2015. 160 с.
3. Омелянович-Павленко М. Спогади командарма (1917–1920). Київ : Темпора, 2007. 608 с.
4. Салтовська Н., Салтовська Д. Національні політичні гасла спротиву періоду повномасштабної агресії 2022 року. Вісник Київського національного університету ім. Т. Шевченка. Літературознавство. Мовознавство. Фольклористика. 2022. № 2(32). С. 68–71. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2659.2022.32.13>
5. Стеблівський Є. Лють : роман. Харків : Фабула, 2024. 256 с.
6. Юзич Ю. Гасло, якого боялися й уникали. Локальна історія. URL: <https://localhistory.org.ua/texts/stati/gaslo-iaakogo-boialisia-i-unicali/> (дата звернення: 25.03.2026).
7. Anderson B. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London : Verso, 2006. 240 p.
8. Austin J. L. How to Do Things with Words. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1962. 166 p.
9. Bernstein B. Class, Codes and Control. Vol. 4. London : Routledge, 1990. 235 p.
10. Billig M. Banal Nationalism. London : Sage, 1995. 200 p.

11. De Cillia R., Reisigl M., Wodak R. The Discursive Construction of National Identities. *Discourse & Society*. 1999. Vol. 10(2). P. 149–173.
12. Fairclough N. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge : Polity Press, 1992. 259 p.
13. Foucault M. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London : Routledge, 2002. 239 p.
14. Heritage J., Greatbatch D. Generating Applause. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1986. Vol. 92(1). P. 110–157.
15. Kristeva J. *Séméiotiké: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris : Seuil, 1969. 379 p.
16. Kulyk V. Language and Identity in Ukraine after Euromaidan. *Nationalities Papers*. 2019. Vol. 47(4). P. 602–619.
17. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1980. 256 p.
18. Reisigl M., Wodak R. *Discourse and Discrimination*. London : Routledge, 2001. 298 p.
19. Searle J. R. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1969. 203 p.
20. Van Dijk T. A. *Discourse and Power*. New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. 308 p.
21. Van Dijk T. A. *Ideology and Discourse*. London : Sage, 2023. 280 p.
22. Van Leeuwen T. *Discourse and Practice*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2008. 172 p.
23. Wodak R. et al. *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2009. 276 p.

#### REFERENCES

1. Pro vnesennia zmin do deiakykh zakoniv Ukrainy shchodo vitannia «Slava Ukraini! – Heroiam slava!» [On Amendments Regarding the Greeting “Slava Ukraini! – Heroiam Slava!”] : *Zakon Ukrainy vid 04.10.2018 No 2587-VIII*. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/go/2587-19> [in Ukrainian].
2. Masenko L. (2015) «Razom – syla!»: Rytoryka ukraïnskoho sprotyvu [“Together We Are Strong!”: The Rhetoric of Ukrainian Resistance]. Kyiv: Klio. 160 p. [in Ukrainian].
3. Omelianovich-Pavlenko M. (2007) *Spohady komandarma (1917–1920)* [Memoirs of an Army Commander]. Kyiv: Tempora. 608 p. [in Ukrainian].
4. Saltovska N., Saltovska D. (2022) Natsionalni politychni hasla sprotyvu [National Political Slogans of Resistance]. *Visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu im. T. Shevchenka*, 2(32), 68–71. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2659.2022.32.13> [in Ukrainian].
5. Steblivskiy Ye. (2024) *Liut : roman* [Fury : a novel]. Kharkiv : Fabula. 256 p. [in Ukrainian].
6. Yuzych Yu. Haslo, yakoho boialysia y unykaly [The Slogan That Was Feared and Avoided]. *Lokalna istoriia*. URL: <https://localhistory.org.ua/texts/statti/gaslo-iakogo-boialisia-i-unykali/> [in Ukrainian].
7. Anderson B. (2006) *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso. 240 p.
8. Austin J. L. (1962) *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 166 p.
9. Bernstein B. (1990) *Class, Codes and Control*. Vol. 4. London: Routledge. 235 p.
10. Billig M. (1995) *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage. 200 p.
11. De Cillia R., Reisigl M., Wodak R. (1999) The Discursive Construction of National Identities. *Discourse & Society*, 10(2), 149–173.
12. Fairclough N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 259 p.
13. Foucault M. (2002) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge. 239 p.
14. Heritage J., Greatbatch D. (1986) Generating Applause. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(1), 110–157.
15. Kristeva J. (1969) *Séméiotiké: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Seuil. 379 p.
16. Kulyk V. (2019) Language and Identity in Ukraine after Euromaidan. *Nationalities Papers*, 47(4), 602–619.
17. Lakoff G., Johnson M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 256 p.
18. Reisigl M., Wodak R. (2001) *Discourse and Discrimination*. London: Routledge. 298 p.
19. Searle J. R. (1969) *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 203 p.
20. Van Dijk T. A. (2008) *Discourse and Power*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 308 p.
21. Van Dijk T. A. (2023) *Ideology and Discourse*. London: Sage. 280 p.
22. Van Leeuwen T. (2008) *Discourse and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 172 p.
23. Wodak R. et al. (2009) *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 276 p.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 05.03.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 25.03.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 19.05.2026

Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу (CC BY 4.0)

